Hodgins, Frank E [Commissioner on Medical Education] Sept 1916-June 1917

(52)

542

THE SUPREME COURT OF ONTARIO
APPELLATE DIVISION
Hon. Mr. Justice Hodgins.

OSGOODE HALL,
TORONTO.

20th September, 1916.

My dear Mr. President:

I am enclosing a statement which I have received from Dr. H. B. Anderson, and which I desire to call your attention to. I think some if not all of the matters referred to may be within my commission, though I have not critically examined it from that point of view. If so, no doubt you will desire to answer it, and I think that can best be done at the sittings of the Commission.

Perhaps I should say, having reference to the openeing sentence of the statement, that I received some time ago from Dr. Herbert Bruce a statement that there were some matters connected with medical ~~education~~ teaching including consideration of the medical services which he wished to bring to my attention and had hoped to do so before he left for the front but that Dr. Anderson was familiar with his views. I was not aware what these views were, but asked him to submit in writing whatever views he had. The enclosed is the result.

also J.A.

Yours faithfully,

Frank E. Hodgins

Dr. R. A. Falconer, C.M.G.,
President, University of Toronto,
Toronto, Ont.

543

September 25th, 1916

Honourable Mr. Justice Hodgins,

Parliament Buildings,

Toronto.

Your Lordship:

I have to thank you for sending me the memorandum from Dr. H. E. Anderson in which he sets forth certain grievances that he entertains against the University and the Toronto General Hospital.

I think that it would not be proper for us to appear before the Commission in person and answer this statement, as Dr. Anderson is a member of the staff of the University. I am, however, sending you a reply to his memorandum in which I endeavour to cover the main objections that he has presented.

I am,

Yours sincerely,

President.

545

September 23rd, 1916

Answer to Memorandum of Dr. Anderson.

Section. 1.

Dr. Anderson apparently does not desire amendments in the University Act but to secure changes in the procedure of the Faculty of Medicine. With all due respect I would suggest that if Dr. Anderson believes that the present system works injuriously or has created an injustice he should send in a memorial to the Board of Governors through the President of the University. The practice of having heads of departments and holding them responsible for the direction and oversight of the teaching is not confined to the Faculty of Medicine, and to change it so as to grant independent powers to other members of the departments would I believe result in the greatest confusion. Undoubtedly the success of any department depends upon the degree in which the head of a department secures the co-operation of its members. Lack of harmony may be due to the head or the subordinates or both. Section 1. can hardly be interpreted otherwise than as a complaint to you as to the way in which the Head of the Department of Medicine conducts his duties as Head.

Section 2.

This section is also a criticism of the method by which the Council of the Faculty of Medicine has constituted and ordered the conduct of its Committees. Surely this is a question of internal

economy, and if any complaint is to be brought against the methods of conducting the business of the Faculty it should be made to the Senate and the Board of Governors.

Section 3.

My same general criticism would hold in regard to this section. There has been a standing complaint in the Faculty on the part of the clinicians that the time given to the clinical work, namely 2 1/2 years, is too short and that the preliminary sciences absorb too much attention. This is a complaint that is not confined to this university. But the division was made so that neither side got as much as they desired. It is in the main in order to remove this difficulty that the proposal has been laid before the Senate to extend the medical course from five to six years. But this matter was decided in the open Faculty of which Dr. Anderson is a member.

Section 5.

If this were so it would be quite unwarrantable. No single individual, whether he be the head or not has the right to determine marks apart from the other examiners who are appointed by the Senate. The report is the report of the examiners as a whole, though any one may dissent when the report is presented to the Faculty Council. With the permission of the Senate the Faculty deliberately abolished the use of pseudonyms believing that it is fairer to the student to examine him openly, especially as the clinical examination is the most important.

Section 6.

This is not a purely university question and if the teaching facilities granted to the University interfere with the proper conduct of the services in the Hospital complaint should be made by the heads of services to the Trustees of the Hospital concerned, who will then confer upon the complaint with the University authorities. There is a joint Board of the University and the General and St. Michael's hospitals which can deal with such a matter.

Underlying this section is the same objection as above to unified control of teaching through the Head of a Department who will supervise all the clinical teaching in all the hospitals. Instead of working through committees, it is probable that in the future more responsibility will be placed upon the head, especially if the policy be inaugurated of appointing as heads those who will give all or the major part of their time to teaching and oversight of the university work. It must be borne in mind that the University has contributed a large sum of money for the very purpose of securing especial control of its teaching in the Toronto General Hospital. The University has privileges rather than rights in the other Hospitals.

Section 7.

It was distinctly arranged that the Pathological Building should be placed on the grounds of the Toronto General Hospital to ensure that the University should have control of one hospital and provide

scientific facilities of the highest order in its immediate vicinity especially in view of clinical work.

Section 8.

This again is a complaint as to the manner in which some head or heads of departments exercise their undoubted right of making recommendations for promotion or removal.

The appointment of a non-clinical member of the Medical Faculty to the Board of the Toronto General Hospital was not made by the Board of Governors of the University, nor at their instance. Dr. Macallum is appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, and the first appointment was made when Sir James Whitney was Premier.

Section 9.

The standing policy of the Board of Governors has been in accordance with the University Act, that they shall appoint the Dean on the nomination of the President.

Section 10.

I agree with Dr. Anderson if this is the case. But I have never heard of such an instance. Dr. Anderson should certainly complain of this to the Governors through the President.

Section 11.

The University met its requirements in the Pathological laboratories erected at its own expense on the Hospital grounds. It made no request for further laboratory accommodation in the Toronto General Hospital for its students and staff.

Section 12.

Dr. Anderson is referring to a Fund raised by Dr. McPhedran from gentlemen in Toronto for the purposes of Medical Research. Hitherto the work of this Fund has been done through fellows, most of whom were under the direction of Dr. Leathes, one of the most distinguished Chemical Pathologists of the Anglo-Saxon world, and now under his successor, Dr. Hunter, who is also a man of high competency. The University accepted this Fund. He differs as to its advisability. Already many good results have been accomplished, and there have been under training several young men of most excellent promise. I cannot see why Dr. Anderson should trouble your Lordship with his private opinions as to the value of a Fund which has been raised by private effort and accepted by the Board of Governors.

As to the control over the hospital clinics, that must be left to the Trustees of the Toronto General Hospital. Certainly the university laboratories must be under the control of the Heads of Departments and their use is for purposes of instructing students or providing facilities for research for students, not for private practitioners.

Section 13.

The university recognises that it has a duty to its graduates and recently has established postgraduate work especially for the purpose of aiding those who wish to continue their research and scientific investigation. This will of necessity be most easily conducted during the summer when the students are absent.

This university has an overwhelming majority of its positions

filled by Canadians. But for our national benefit we should welcome distinguished men from Britain or elsewhere if they are the best available and personally suitable.

Section 14.

Dr. Anderson desires a change in the method adopted by the Government when it passed the University Act. I have no desire to set forth in this place the arguments on the other side. I simply say I think his plan would not work.

If Dr. Anderson refers to the publications that are given at the end of my Annual Report, I can simply say that I ask all members of the staff to send me a list of their publications. No one passes upon their merit. I publish the titles as they are sent, and let the expert public act as critic and decide whether it was worth the while of any individual to send me the name of his publication. To have a committee pass upon what shall be included would be a fruitful source of discontent and would cause greater harm through grievances than would come from any occasional criticism as to the mention of unworthy articles.

Section 15.

The policy of the Board as to appointments must be arried out by the President with as much tact and judgment and fairness as he is capable of.

Section 16.

This seems to me to involve a principle that would be extremely difficult to work in the case of Hospitals in which the University has only been granted privileges and has no statutory rights.

Answer to memorandum of Mr. Anderson

Section 1 Mr Anderson apparently does not mean [illegible] but to secure changes in the procedure of the Senate [illegible] respect I would suggest that if Mr Anderson believes that the procedure [illegible] works injuriously or has created an injustice he should [illegible] to the Board of Governors through the President of the University. The practice of having Heads of departments and holding them responsible for the direction and oversight of the teaching is not confined to this [illegible] University, and to change it so as to grant independent powers to other members of the departments would [illegible] the practical [illegible] Undoubtedly the success of any department depends on the [illegible] in which the head of a department [illegible] the [illegible] lack of harmony may be due either to the head or to the subordinates or both. Section 1 can however be interpreted otherwise than as a compliment for as it is the way in which the head of the department of Medicine [illegible] Dutiies as Head

Section 2 This Section ~~as~~ is also in the nature of the matter [illegible] The Council after Faculty of Medicine has considered and ~~an~~ [illegible] the contract of the committee. Surely there is a question of natural [illegible] and if any complaint is to be brought against ~~it if it~~ the methods of [illegible] the promotion of an faculty ~~complained~~ should be made to the senate and the Board of Governors.

I do [illegible] general criticism which I hold [illegible] there has been a standing complaint in the Faculty on the part of the students that the time from 5 ~~to~~ the clinical work [illegible] and that the preliminary lectures should be [illegible] There is a complaint that is not confined to this University. But the decision was made to the written rule get as much as they deserve. It is the main in order to remedy this difficulty that the proposal has been laid before the senate to extend the medical course from five to six years. But this matter was decided in the affirmative by Mr Thomson and

5. ~~It~~ If this were so it would be quite unwarrantable. No single individual, whether he be the head or not has the right to determine marks apart from the other examiners who are appointed by the Senate. The report is the report of the examiners as a whole though any one may dissent when the report is presented to the Senate for approval.

6 This is not a purely university question as it is the teaching facilities provided by the University which form the proper content of the services in the Hospitals. Complaints should be made by the heads of services to the Trustees of the Hospitals concerned, who will then ~~refer~~ confer upon the complaint with the University authorities. There is a Joint Board of the University & the Royal & St Michael's Hospitals which can deal with this matter if a matter

~~The same~~ Underlying this section is the same objection as above to unified control of teaching through the Head of a Hospital who will supervise all the clinical teaching in all the hospitals. Instead of working through committees, it is more possible that in the future more responsibility will be placed upon the head, especially of the policy & staffing of heads who may be juniors or the younger part of those who have to teach & the work of the hospital. It must be borne in mind that the University has contributed a large sum of money for the new hospital & very important control of the teaching in the ~~the~~ of this hospital rather than right in the other hospitals.

7. It was naturally arranged that the Pathological Building should be placed in the grounds of the Hosp. to insure that the University should have control of one hospital of prime scientific facilities of the highest value in its immediate vicinity especially in view of clinical work

8. This again is in conformity with the manner in which heads of Departments exercise their [illegible] the right of making recommendations for promotion or removal. #

The appointment of a non-clinical member of the Medical Faculty to the Board of the Hosp. was not made by the Board of Governors of the University nor at their instance. [illegible] is the appointee of the [illegible] of Governors [illegible]

9 The standing policy of the Board of Governors has been in accordance with the [illegible] that they shall appoint the Dean on the nomination of the President.

10 I agree with Dr Anderson if this is the case. I have never heard an instance ~~[illegible]~~. Dr Anderson should certainly complain of this to the Governors through the President. The University made no arrangement in the Pathological [illegible] [illegible] of [illegible] [illegible] Cathcart fund. ~~[illegible]~~ made no suggestion for further laboratory accommodation with the [illegible] [illegible] staff.

11 ~~[illegible]~~

12 Dr Anderson is referring to a fund donated by Dr. [illegible] for fellowships or grants for the purposes of Medical Research. It thinks the work of the fund has been done through fellows, most of whom were under the direction of Dr Leathes, one of the best distinguished chemical pathologists of the Anglo-Saxon world (now under his successor Dr [illegible] who is also a man of high competency. The University accepted the fund, the Dollars [illegible] it is advisable

already many good results have been accomplished, & ~~we~~ ~~have~~ there have been made trial several years past of well-tested processes. I cannot see why Dr. S. should trouble himself with the private opinions, or the value of the Board which has been passed by private effort & accepted by the Board of Governors. As to the control over the hospital clinics, & the benefit of their use by the students, it will be left to the profession after they shall be known, laboratories and to under the control of the Minds of Profs. & there is no ~~need for the provision of the~~ fee for purposes of instituting Chairs or Prof. & probably for years for the students, but for private practitioners.

13 Regarding management that it has actually been found & actually has established partnership with Government for the purpose of higher class education & students from country & Stranger ~~made~~ this will apparently be more so & conducted among the students when the students are ahead.

This community has an overbalance majority of different religious Christians but for the national benefit we should welcome Christianized men from Indian or Chinese of the best & most valuable & generally suitable

14 Regarding desire & change in the method adopted by the Board of forming the Board. Have no desire to see it left to the Government to the other side. Simply suggested the idea.

If Dr A refers to the publication that are given at the end of my report, I can only say that I have made all members of the staff send me a list of their publications for the present year. If possible the little [illegible] they are sent & let the report publication [illegible] Critic as the [illegible] [illegible] if we could [illegible] to publish [illegible] the [illegible] To have a committee to pass upon what shall be included would be a fruitful source of discontent & of course greater pressure would come from [illegible] than from any other [illegible] by the [illegible] of [illegible]

15. [illegible] the policy of the Board in the appointments must be carried out & the Board will [illegible] tact & judgment & fairness in [illegible] of [illegible]

16. This seems like to involve a principle that would be extremely difficult to work in the case of [illegible] which the University has only [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

THE SUPREME COURT OF ONTARIO
APPELLATE DIVISION

OSGOODE HALL.
TORONTO.

December 15th 1916.

Dr. Falconer,

President, Toronto University,

Toronto.

Dear Dr. Falconer :

I have received a letter from Dr. Anderson and now beg to enclose to you his reply to your statement which you will recollect you sent me some time ago dealing with the matters which he had originally brought forward. I am still undecided whether all the matters referred to come within my province, but as I shall have to consider the matter I should like to know whether you have anything further to say.

After you have read the enclosed kindly return both the memorandum and the addendum thereto.

Believe me,

Faithfully yours,

Bart B Hodgins

December 15th, 1916

Hon. Mr. Justice Hodgins,

Osgoode Hall, Toronto.

Dear Mr. Justice Hodgins:

I am returning you herewith Dr. Anderson's reply to my letter together with the affidavit which he forwarded to you.

I do not think that there is any necessity for me to make any further answer.

Dr. Anderson quotes me at the foot of page 15 as saying "that the control over the hospital clinics must be left to the Trustees". Instead of saying "clinics" I should have said "services", because the University does not control the services even in the General Hospital. We have complete satisfaction as to the head of the service, but we have no say as to how the head of that service shall conduct the service. So in the other Hospitals, all that we ask is that we shall approve of those who are nominated to the heads of the services in which our instruction is given so that these gentlemen may be placed upon our staff. We control the clinics in each hospital for teaching, but this can only be done through the head of the department of medicine if we are to have any control at

all and are to secure anything like uniformity of practice and standard. I am sorry that I placed the word "clinic" where I was thinking of "service".

Yours sincerely,

President.

[illegible], 15th, 1916

To the Honourable the Commissioner on Medical Education,

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] our to submit to you the following memorandum [illegible] in regard to standards for Junior Matriculation.

[illegible] to the destruction of our records it is impossible [illegible] the average which will indicate the standard prior to that [illegible] [illegible] corresponds to the standard as being 25%. [illegible] [illegible] that the standard was 25% on each [illegible] with 40% on the whole examination, and that seems to have [illegible] until the examination of 1890, when it became 33 1/3 % on [illegible] the candidate. That standard was in force [illegible] [illegible] clearer definition [illegible] subjects into two papers each, a return to 33% on a subject, although there was in the June examination a strict maintenance of the 25% on each paper, but in the [illegible] were decided on the basis of 33% in a subject. [illegible] in force for 1905, 1906 and 1907. [illegible] to 33% on each paper. In 1908 it was raised to 40% on each paper, which policy held good for 1910. In 1911 the standard was raised to 40% on each paper with an average of 50%, and was further advanced in 1912 to 40% on each paper with an average of 60%, which standard is still in force.

In the year 1908 by agreement with the various Universities of the Province and the Department of Education the Matriculation Board was constituted, consisting of eight members, four representing the University of Toronto, one Queen's University, one the Western University and one McMaster University.

The standards of Matriculation are determined by the Senate of the University of Toronto after consultation at a conference of representatives of the four universities of the Province held annually. Therefore the Universities of the Province determine the standards of Matriculation which are announced through the Senate of the University of Toronto to the Matriculation Board. This board is really the executive of the Universities. It appoints the examiners, and oversees the carrying out of the regulations and issues matriculation certificates. It has no legislative functions.

Yours sincerely,

President.

February 16th, 1917

The Honourable the Commissioner on Medical Education,

Toronto.

Sir:

I have the honour to forward to you herewith the following memoranda:

(1) An Outline of the Development of Medical Education in the University of Toronto.

(2) A Statement setting forth the History of Matriculation Standards as observed by the Universities of the Province.

(3) A Memorandum setting forth the Financial Needs of the Faculty of Medicine of the University of Toronto.

(4) A Reply to the Memorandum of the Senate of Queen's University with regard to the Proposed Six Years Course in Medicine.

I am,

Yours sincerely,

President.

March 1st, 1917

Honourable Mr. Justice Hodgins,

Commissioner on Medical Education,

Osgoode Hall, Toronto.

Dear Mr. Justice Hodgins:

I have consulted with Dean Clarke about your reference to the appearance before the Commission of representativ of the Committee on Social Service relating to Public Health. I, mysel have only very general information about it, but Dr. Clarke advises me that if you would refer to ~~me~~ or Dr. Hastings, Mr. Hudson or Miss Gunn Superintendent of Nurses at the Toronto General Hospital, they would be able to give you the outlines of what work has been done and any further information that you may desire with regard to the movement.

I am,

Yours sincerely,

President.

463

June 20th, 1917

Hon. Mr. Justice Hodgins,

Toronto.

Dear Mr. Justice Hodgins:

Dean Clarke has brought before me the case of Dr. M. A. Kendrick of Milcox, Sask. who is in difficulties with regard to his registration on account of the regulations of the Ontario Medical Council. Dr. Kendrick graduated from the University of Toronto in Medicine in 1907 and has practised in Saskatchewan since 1908. On account of ill-health he did not take his Ontario Medical Council at the time of his graduation, but wrote his license examination for Saskatchewan in 1908 and on Dec. 30th, 1916, he registered with the General Medical Council of England by reciprocity. He felt sure that he could comply with the regulations of the Ontario Medical Council, but he is informed that this Council cannot register him although if he had obtained his education and university diploma in Britain or even in the State of Michigan he could have been registered in this Province. You will see reference made to his case on page 102 of the Announcement of the College of Physicians and Surgeons for 1916-17. This is surely an anomalous state of affairs and might result should it continue in sending students from outside Ontario who may wish to practise in Ontario to take their education in other Provinces where they can also register and get reciprocity with Britain and even be registered in this Province.

We have another inquiry from Dr. Coulter of the West who is in somewhat a similar condition, but finds the fact that he was one of our graduates a barrier to registration here.

With kind regards, I am,

Yours sincerely,

President.